



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

III.—ADDITIONAL NOTES ON THE VOCATIVE.

LYRIC POETS.

The *ῥθος* of the interjection with the vocative in the Lyric Poets is much the same as in Homer,¹ and denotes impatience, familiarity, or lack of reserve. The sphere of familiarity is extended so as, rarely however, to include the gods, and the use is wider. Taking the Lyric Poets as given in Hiller, also Pindar, Bacchylides, and Timotheus, the vocative is used with the interjection 184 times, with it omitted, 461 times. That is, the interjection is used with but 28% of the vocatives. In general, those poets who are most familiar in tone use the interjection most. Theognis in the first Eleg. omits the interjection 123 times and uses it but 5; while the coarser Eleg. B has the interjection 17 times and omits it but 7. Alcaeus, Anacreon, the Scholia, and the Carmina Popularia have the interjection with nearly 60% of the vocatives, while Stesichorus with 4 vocatives has no interjection, and Alcman has but one in 11, and that one *ὦ δλεῖ δαίμων*, frag. 79, reveals the tone. Pindar has 65 in 205. Where Pindar is most stately he is very sparing of the interjection. In the First Olympian "Pindar is consciously treading a lofty measure", and so although there are five vocatives, there are no interjections, while the Sixth Isthmian, of a very different *ῥθος*, has the same number of vocatives, each with *ὦ*. Pindar assumes a peculiar attitude towards the Muses, and regards them as his own familiar friends. He is the first Greek poet to say *ὦ Μοῖσα* or *ὦ Μοῖσαι*. Although the Muses are addressed 16 times by others of the Lyric Poets, the vocatives *Μοῦσα* and *Μοῦσαι* are never used with the interjection by them, Pindar is the only Lyric Poet who uses *ὦ* in speaking to the Muses; cf. O. 10, 3; 11, 18; N. 3, 1; I. 6, 57. This presumption of Pindar's did not escape the notice of Aristophanes who in his parody of Pindar departs from his own usual custom and says *ὦ Μοῦσα*, Av. 905. For the proofs that this is a parody on Pindar, see Scholiast and Kock on Av. 905.

A striking proof of the familiar tone of the interjection is the fact that in addresses to the *παιδικά* it is always used.

¹ See A. J. P. XXIV, 192 ff. and XXV, 81 ff.

The single exception to this, among 21 examples, is Theog. 1249, where this vocative coming in a series of vocatives, each with the interjection, hardly violates the rule. Similar is Pindar's ὦ παῖδες, Frag. 122, 6 addressed to the courtesans of Corinth. At the other extreme lie the dignified patronymics which do not take the interjection. Theog. 25, 57, 61, 79, 129, 143, 191, 377, 541, 738, 1197; Alcman 7a; Archil. 7, 1; 76, 1; Sol. 19, 3; Anacreon 103; Pind. P. I, 71; 5, 45, 118; 9, 30; N. 7, 70; 9, 28; 10, 76. In the four places where the patronymic takes an interjection, the reserve implied in the form of the word is lost in the tone of the whole. Arch. 96, 1, ὦ Κηρυκίδη' ἀχυνμένη σκυτάλη. Alcaeus 76 is of a similar tone. In Anac. 74. ὦ ῥιστοκλείδῃ, πρῶτον οἰκτίρω φίλων, the patronymic is used in pity, hence the interjection, and the other example, Simon. 98, is in the last words of a dying son to his father, and is certainly familiar.

In the speech of the gods the interjection is not used, cf. Hipponax 25, Pind. O. 6, 62, 13, 67, P. 9, 30. The one exception is where Aphrodite uses the extremely familiar 'ὦ Ψάπφ', Sappho I, 20.

Taken as a whole, the only conclusion for the Lyric Poets is that the vocative ordinarily does not have the interjection, and that the interjection, when used, indicates a throwing off of reserve, either to denote stress, familiarity, or emotion.

HERODOTUS.

The use of the interjection in Herodotus is strikingly similar to that of Sophocles, and the proportions are exactly the same, as each uses the interjection with 60% of the vocatives. The exact number for Herodotus, omitting the oracles, is vocative with ὦ 171, without ὦ 116. He too uses the interjection with participles, with adjectives used as substantives, and in appeals to the inanimate; and like Sophocles, he does not use the interjection with proper names of persons. The vocative of proper names of persons is used without ὦ 47 times, with it but twice. The rough speech of Adeimantus to Themistocles, VIII, 59, ὦ Θεμιστόκλεες ἐν τοῖσι ἀγῶσι οἱ προεξανιστάμενοι ῥαπτίζονται. is certainly unusual both in its thought and manner. In I 32, Solon twice uses the interjection in reply to the impatient and vexed Croesus, Κροῖσος δὲ σπερχθεις εἶπε. With no violations of this rule in Aesch. or Soph. and these two out of 49 in Her., it is evident that the omission of ὦ is no accident, and that the familiar tone of the interjection was

out of place with proper names of persons. "Sir Walter" is the English equivalent for the vocative without the interjection, "Walter" for the vocative with it. Exactly in keeping with this is the fact that before such expressions as *ἄνδρες σύμμαχοι*, *ἄνδρες στρατιῶται*, *ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι* the interjection is not used, while with *ἄνδρες* omitted in names of peoples, the interjection is always used. I, 125, ὦ Πέρσαι, but 126, ἄνδρες Πέρσαι; VIII, 140, ὦ Ἀθηναῖοι, but ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι; IX, 26, ὦ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, but ἄνδρες Σπαρτιῆται. Herodotus has 38 examples of this use of *ἄνδρες*, I, 126, III, 71, 73, 83, 137. IV, 3, 98, 133, 136, 139, 158, V, 91, 98, 109. VI, 9, 11, 85, 97, 130. VII, 8, 13, 135, 150, 158, 172, VIII, 22, 24, 118, 140, IX, 9, 21, 26, 45, 60, 82, 87, 89, 98. The only one of all these that has the interjection is IX, 89, where the fleeing Artabazus says ὦ ἄνδρες Θεσσαλοί. The use of the interjection here may be intended to picture his perplexity, or his coarseness.

Sophocles also always omits the interjection in the use of kindred expressions, Ajax, 565, ἄνδρες ἀσπιστῆρες, 719, ἄνδρες φίλοι O. R. 512, ἄνδρες πολῖται, O. C. 1579, ἄνδρες πολῖται.

These two classes, the vocative of proper names of persons, and phrases with *ἄνδρες*, cover about three-fourths of the vocatives without the interjection in Herodotus.

These two following examples from the words of Croesus show well the distinction between the vocative without the interjection, and the vocative with it. I, 30, when Croesus wishes to flatter Solon, and to be flattered by him he says, *Ξεῖνε Ἀθηναῖε, παρ' ἡμέας γὰρ περὶ σέο λόγος ἀπῖκται πολλὸς καὶ σοφίης τῆς σῆς καὶ πλάνης κτλ.* but when the reply provokes him he says, ὦ ξεῖνε Ἀθηναῖε, ἡ δ' ἡμετέρη εὐδαιμονία οὕτω τοι ἀπέρριπται ἐς τὸ μηδέν, ὥστε οὐδὲ ἰδιωτέων ἀνδρῶν ἀξίους ἡμέας ἐποίησας; and it is in reply to this that Solon uses the only interjection used with the proper name of a person, except the taunt of Adeimantus to Themistocles quoted above.

Hence also the familiar family greetings such as father, mother, wife, son, and daughter have the interjection; cf. I, 37, 38, 39, 40, 111, 121. III, 3, 50, 52, 53, 69, 119 (bis) 134 (bis). V, 19 bis. VI, 68, 69 (bis). VII, 16, β. No exceptions to this rule.

EURIPIDES.

The percentage of vocatives with the interjection is lower in Euripides than in Sophocles and Herodotus. The exact figures for Euripides are, omitting the fragments, vocatives with interjection 1144, without 971. The interjection is used with 54 per

cent of the vocatives in Euripides, with 60 per cent in Sophocles and Herodotus.

The rules for the use of the interjection are:

I. The vocative of the participle, when used without the noun or when the noun is used in apposition to the participial phrase must have the interjection. As there are about one hundred examples of this use, I shall illustrate from Nauck's first and last plays, *The Alcestis* and *Phoenissae*.

Alcestis, 407, ὦ σκέτλια δὴ παθῶν
 625, ὦ τόνδε μὲν σώσας',
 697, ὦ κάκισθ' ἡσσημένος
 837, ὦ πολλὰ τλᾶσα

Phoenissae, 1, ὦ τὴν ἐν ἄστροις οὐρανοῦ τέμνων ὁδὸν
 "Ἥλιε.—Here Ἥλιε is in apposition to the participial phrase.

84. ὦ φαεινὰς οὐρανοῦ ναίων πτυχὰς
 Ζεῦ.—Example of the same use as the preceding.

Other examples of the interjection with the participle in this play are 226, 298, 310, 580, 917, 1270, 1436, 1447, 1536. Since the interjection is not used with the unmodified names of persons, and since it is always used with the participle, the translation of such a vocative as is found in *Iph. Taur.* 17:

ὦ τῆσδ' ἀνάσσων Ἑλλάδος στρατηγίας
 Ἀγάμεμνον,

is not "O Agamemnon, thou who dost wield the military power of Hellas" but "O thou who dost wield the military power of Hellas, thou Agamemnon". A more intricate example is *Phoen.* 580:

ὦ κακὰ μνηστεύματα
 Ἀδραστε προσθείς,

which is not "O Adrastus, thou who didst press baneful wooings" but "O thou who didst press baneful wooings, thou Adrastus". Liddell and Scott miss the point entirely, by translating it "oh baneful spousals" thus removing the interjection from the participle, and changing an accusative to the vocative.

II. In addresses to the inanimate, especially to parts of the body, as *χείρ*, *χρῶς*, *πούς* and similar words, or in addresses to implements or parts of the house, the interjection is not omitted.

The large number of examples under this rule makes it impossible to illustrate from more than two plays.

Alcestis, 1, ὦ δώματ' Ἀδμήτει'

177, ὦ λέκτρον

234, ὦ Φεραία χθών, also 569, 837, 861, 895, 911, 1133.

Phoen. 88, 182, 191, 226, 256, 613, 629, 678, 801, 818, 884, 1019, 1290, 1342, 1500, 1595, 1701, 1702, 1764. The only one of these which does not have the interjection is Phoen. 629, *κἄν* τί σοι, πόλις, where the interjection was not used because of the preceding σοί. The apparent exception in Alcestis 248 is due to the fact that the words are part of an appeal beginning with a name of the god Ἄλκιε and so the interjection need not be used, as the initial word of the series gives the tone to the whole. There are but few exceptions to this rule in the other plays.

III. When the first syllable of the third foot in trimeter is a monosyllabic vocative the interjection must be used.

Alcestis 509, χαῖρ', ὦ Διὸς παῖ

539, οὐκ ἔστιν, ὦναξ, The last word here is treated as a true monosyllable.

Phoen. 154, εἴη τάδ', ὦ παῖ.

1432, ᾗμοξεν* ὦ τέκν'

1703, νῦν χρησμός, ὦ παῖ,

Euripides has sixty examples of this use of the interjection. The only exceptions are the following, El. 1238, I. A. 1405, I. T. 1158, 1474, each having Ἀγαμέμνωνος παῖ, Phoen. 532, Φιλοτιμίας, παῖ; Rhesus 669, Λαερτίου παῖ, 916, Φιλάμμωνος παῖ. In each of these exceptions the first two feet are made up of a single word, and the insertion of the interjection in the verse is impossible. There are no other exceptions.

IV. An adjective used in the vocative without a noun regularly has the interjection.

Alcestis 144, ὦ τλήμον, 250, ὦ τάλαινα, 258, ὦ δύσδαιμον, 460, ὦ μόνα, 717, ὦ κάκιστ', 741, ὦ γενναία καὶ μέγ' ἀρίστη, 824, ὦ σχέτλι'.

Phoen. 124, 171, 884, 1072, 1671. No exception to this rule in the Alcestis or the Phoenissae. Some of the other plays have rare exceptions.

Repeated vocatives such as τέκνα τέκνα, ὦ δόμος δόμος do not differ in the use of the interjection from the single form. These repeated forms are comparatively rare in Euripides, and as far as the vocative is concerned, do not bear out the note of Weck-

lein to Phoen. 819, "Diese Wiederholung des Wortes ist eine dem Euripides eigentümliche Weise lyrischen Ausdrucks".

Three of the plays have no repeated vocative, viz. H. F. Suppl. I. T., while no play of Sophocles is without them. Sophocles in seven plays has nineteen repeated vocatives, while Euripides in nineteen plays has but thirty. Sophocles not only uses these repeated vocatives more freely than Euripides, but is much bolder in the words used. Euripides has a parallel to O. R. 1403, ὦ γάμοι γάμοι, in Androm. 1186, and to O. R. 629, ὦ πόλις πόλις in Androm. 1211, but he has nothing to match Trach. 1089, ὦ χέρες χέρες, nor Phil. 1188, ὦ ποὺς ποὺς. About one-half of all these repeated vocatives in Euripides are put in the mouth of Hecuba.

In the Teubner edition of Aeschylus there are twenty such repeated vocatives, so that Aeschylus uses them more often than Sophocles or Euripides. The Agamemnon has more repeated vocatives than any other Greek tragedy.

V. Class terms such as πρόσπολοι, δμῶες, ὀπαδοί, and all words denoting slaves or servants, have the vocative without ὦ, unless said by one servant to another.

Androm. 426, δμῶες, and also in 715.

Bacchae 1217, πρόσπολοι.

Hec. 1282, δμῶες.

Hel. 1170, δμῶες, 1181, ὀπαδοί, 1391, δμῶες.

El. 360, ὀπαδοί, 394, δμῶες, 851, παλαιοὶ δμῶες, 960, δμῶες, 1135, ὀπάονες.

Her. 1050, δμῶες, 1053, ὀπαδοί.

H. F. 724, πρόσπολοι.

Sup. 1115, ἀμφίπολοι.

Hip. 108, ὀπαδοί, 200, πρόσπολοι. 808, πρόσπολοι. 1084, 1184, 1358, δμῶες.

I. A. 1340, δμῶες, I. T. 638, πρόσπολοι, also 1205.

Ion, 510, πρόσπολοι, 666, δμῶίδες, 1250, πρόσπολοι.

Medea, 1314, πρόσπολοι. Orestes 629, πρόσπολοι, 1380, 'Ελένης πρόσπολ'.

Rhesus 804, ἡνίοχε, Tro. 295, δμῶες, 880, ὀπάονες. While free persons kept slaves at a distance and did not address them with the interjection, slaves could use to each other the familiar ὦ. Androm. 64, ὦ φιλότατη σύνδουλε, Ion, 1109, ὦ σύνδουλε. This rule is not violated by Aesch. Cf. Ag. 908, δμῶαί, Choeph. 84, δμῶαί

γυναῖκες. 719, δμῳίδες οἴκων. Compare also Soph. Antig. 578, δμῶες, 1108, ὁπάονες. 1214, πρόσπολοι, Trach. 1264, ὁπαδοί.

The use of the interjection in O. R. 945 is a fine touch.

Iocasta. τί δ'; οὐχ ὁ πρέσβυς Πόλυβος ἐγκρατὴς ἐτι;

Messenger. οὐ δῆτ', ἐπεὶ νυν θάνατος ἐν τάφοις ἔχει,

Iocasta. ὦ πρόσπολ', οὐχὶ δεσπότη τάδ' ὥς τάχος|μολοῦσα λέξεις;
Iocasta in her ecstasy of joy pays no thought to class distinctions, and so uses ὦ before πρόσπολος, the only example in the extant Greek tragedies.

Sophocles has one example of ἰώ with the vocative of a word denoting servitude, but the speaker has absolutely renounced himself and his authority.

Antigone 1320. Creon. ἐγὼ γάρ σ' ἐγὼ ἔκανον, ὦ μέλεος,
ἐγὼ, φάμ' ἔτυμον. ἰὼ πρόσπολοι,
ἄγετέ μ' ὅ τι τάχιστ', ἄγετέ μ' ἐκποδών,
τὸν οὐκ ὄντα μᾶλλον ἢ μηδένα.

Here there can be no thought of class distinctions, and the interjection deepens the tone of self-abandonment and despair. As this rule is not confined to tragedy, but belongs to the common speech also, as will be shown later, it seems to me that the interjection denotes a degree of familiarity beyond that allowed to servants in their intercourse with their masters.

VI. In addresses to persons present the interjection is never added to an unmodified proper name.

Not once in Aeschylus, Sophocles, or Euripides does a single example occur of an unmodified proper name of a person used in the vocative with an interjection. There are 255 examples of this rule in Euripides, and a large number in Aeschylus and Sophocles. The interjection must have added here a certain familiar tone too undignified for tragedy. Euripides gives the very examples needed to illustrate this, Cyclops 539, where the Cyclops addresses Silenus with ὦ Σεληνέ, and he himself is addressed as ὦ Κύκλωψ by Silenus 262. It seems that there must be something in the tone of the interjection, and not an accident that Euripides should address none of his characters by an unmodified name with the interjection, save only Cyclops and Silenus. I do not count Silenus and Cyclops as real persons; hence this is no exception. I. A. 573, the chorus say ὦ Πάρις,

but he is not present, and the same applies to Hel. 1220, Phoen. 1494, and Helen is hardly present, Hel. 1120.

These are not exceptions, as an absent person can be addressed in any desired manner without the tone seeming to him too familiar.

VII. The use of several vocatives in succession with the interjection denotes great excitement, the use of a series without the interjection gives a feeling of calmness or composure. Hence a change from vocatives with the interjection to vocatives without them shows that the speaker has fixed his purpose and gained self-mastery, while the change from vocatives without the interjection to vocatives with *ô* shows loss of self-control.

From many examples of this I select two. Hippolytus, 902 ff. Theseus in wildest anger accosts his son for his supposed attempted crime, while the son with perfect calmness answers him, until the depravity and baseness of Phaedra is forced upon him, then from calmness he changes to the wildest passion and despair. During the time when Hippolytus is master of himself, he uses seven vocatives, not one with the interjection, while every one the father uses has *ô*. With verse 1060 the baseness of it all comes to him, and in the verses immediately following he uses seven vocatives, each with the interjection. The shift from vocative without the interjection to vocative with interjection exactly corresponds to the change in his self-control.

The other illustration is Iphigenia in Aulis 864 ff. Here the real purpose for which Iphigenia is brought to Aulis is found out, and the excitement and anguish is reflected in the vocatives, all of which until 999 have the interjection, finally after struggling, Iphigenia resolves to die, and gains complete control of herself, so that she tells her purpose to her mother 1368 ff., and in the speech which follows she uses four vocatives, not one of which has the interjection.

On the whole, in Euripides the interjection adds familiarity or passion, the absence of the interjection gives a tone of calmness, distance, or reserve.

ARISTOPHANES.

With Aristophanes there is a decided increase in the use of the interjection with the vocative. The interjection is used with 1000 and omitted with 252 vocatives, that is, it is used with 80% of the vocatives.

Most of the cases of omitted interjection fall under five heads.

1) Poetic reminiscence or parody, e. g. Knights 1015 and 1030 Ἐρεχθείδῃ, 1055 Κεκροπίδῃ, 1067 Αἰγείδῃ. Here, as in Homer and the Lyric Poets, the patronymic is used without the interjection. Peace 736, θύγατερ Διός, 775, 816 Μοῦσα. and often in other plays.

2) Avoidance of cacophony after an "ω" in the preceding syllable. The Acharnians has the following examples, 53, 95, 414, 452, 777, 887; so in other plays.

3) In phrases such as ἄνδρες δημόται the interjection is generally omitted, Achar. 328, ἄνδρες δημόται, Knights 242, ἄνδρες ἱππῆς, Wasps 908, ἄνδρες δικασταί. Peace 9, ἄνδρες κομπολόγοι. [Here the omission of the interjection adds to the mock elevation.] Peace 500 ἄνδρες Μεγαρῆς, Lys. 1074, 1122. ἄνδρες Λάκωνες. The interjection is used in such expressions but 4 times, Achar. 56, Clouds 1437, Peace 292, Plutus 322. The emotion which the interjection adds to this phrase is shown by the passage in the Acharnians, 56, ἄνδρες πρυτάνεις, ἀδικεῖτε τὴν ἐκκλησίαν κτλ.

4) In an address to a slave παῖ always omits the interjection, while the interjection is never omitted when παῖ is addressed to a free person, unless modifying words show that the person meant is free.

This use I shall illustrate by the Clouds, as typical of all the plays. Strepsiades calls to the slave, 18, παῖ, λύχνον. but to his son 87, ὦ παῖ, πίθου μοι. to the porter 132, παῖ, παιδίον. 1144, παῖ, ἡμί, παῖ παῖ. Cf. also 614 to a slave μὴ πρίῃ, παῖ, δᾶδ', 1165, ὦ τέκνον, ὦ παῖ, to Pheidippides. In the Frogs 190, when Dionysus calls out παῖ, δειῦρο, Charon at once replies δούλον οὐκ ἄγω, as the use of παῖ alone revealed the slave. Later when the arrival at Hades shifted the relations, Dionysus said, 437, ὦ παῖ. In the Acharnians 1136 after Lamachus has shouted παῖ to his slave ten times, in perplexity he calls ὦ παῖ, which by itself would show his confusion, even if βαβαιάξ· χειμέρια τὰ πράγματα did not follow. [As this rule is even more striking in Plato, the reason for omitting the interjection in calling to a slave will be discussed in the study of Plato.]

5) The interjection is often omitted to give a certain reserve, dignity, or elevation, either actual or in mockery: e. g. Knights 242, 551, 634, 1253.

The following table will show that those plays which have the least elevation have the lowest percentage of vocatives without the interjection, while those with most parody of tragedy and most mock or actual elevation have the most vocatives without ὦ.

	Without ὦ	With ὦ	Percentage of voc. with ὦ
Knights	12	101	89 +
Peace	16	129	89—
Clouds	13	95	88
and at the other extreme			
Frogs	40	72	64
Thes.	40	86	68
Birds	21	82	81

The Knights, perhaps, comes nearest to the common familiar speech, and so has the fewest vocatives without the interjection. The 12 vocatives without ὦ are as follows, three patronymics quoted above, three dignified appeals, one to the Knights, 242, one to the heliasts, 266, one to the βουλή, 654, two lofty appeals to the gods, 551 ἵππι' ἄναξ Πόσειδον, 1253 Ἑλλάνιε Ζεῦ, σὸν τὸ νικητήριον. One epic parody 634, where the mock elevation is made more striking by the omission of the interjection:

ἄγε δὴ Σκίταλοι καὶ Κόβαλοι καὶ Μόθων, κτλ.

One 786, pictures the awe with which the Sausage-seller is regarded:

ἄνθρωπε, τις εἶ; μὲν ἔκγονος εἶ τῶν Ἀρμοδίου τις ἐκείνων;

One is a mock dignified appeal to Demos.

1207, τί οὐ διακρίνεις, Δῆμ'. And the last of the twelve vocatives without ὦ is addressed to slaves, 418 παῖδες, so no interjection.

Every time the vocative is used without the interjection in the Knights, it is in an expression of reserve or mock elevation.

For Aristophanes the only conclusion is, the more elevated his style, the less he uses the interjection, while the nearer his language approaches to the common vulgar speech, the more is ὦ used with the vocative.

PLATO.

There is but one important exception to the rule that in Plato the vocative has the interjection. Everywhere a slave is addressed as παῖ the interjection is omitted; while a similar address to a free person never omits the interjection. The slave is addressed Theaet. 143 C. ἀλλά, παῖ, λαβέ τὸ βιβλίον καὶ λέγε, but Socrates always addresses Theaetetus as ὦ παῖ, 145 D. 151 E. 156 A. 158 A. 200 C. Symposium 175 A, to a slave, οὐ σκέψεις, παῖ, καὶ εἰσάξεις Σωκράτη; 213 E, φέρε, παῖ, τὸν ψυκτῆρα, and in the plural 212 D,

παῖδες, οὐ σκέψασθε; 213 B, ὑπολύετε, παῖδες, Ἄλκιβιάδην. Charmides 155 B, to a slave, παῖ, κάλει Χαρμίδην. In two places where slaves are not treated as slaves the interjection is used. In Meno, where Socrates is teaching geometry to Meno's slave, he treats him not as a slave but a pupil, hence always the interjection, 82 B, 83 C, 85 B. In Symposium 175 B. Agathon says ἀλλ' ἡμᾶς, ὦ παῖδες, τοὺς ἄλλους ἐστιάτε. πάντως παρατίθετε ὃ τι ἂν βούλησθε, ἐπειδὴν τις ὑμῖν μὴ ἐφέστηκη ὃ ἐγὼ οὐδεπώποτε ἐποίησα· νῦν οὖν, νομίζοντες καὶ ἐμὲ ὑφ' ὑμῶν κεκλησθαι κτλ. Here the relation of master and slave is abandoned, and Agathon definitely annuls the relation by the use of the interjection. Outside of the drunken discourse of Alcibiades in the Symposium there are too few examples of the vocative without the interjection to change the rule that, with the exception of addresses to slaves, the vocative always has the interjection. Twenty dialogues, including Republic, Protagoras, Theaetetus, Parmenides, have no exceptions.

The slave was excluded from the interjection simply because it was too familiar, and to use it would have violated Plato's own precept, Laws 778, τὴν δὲ οἰκέτου πρόσρησιν χρὴ σχεδὸν ἐπίταξιν πᾶσαν γίγνεσθαι, μὴ προσπαίζοντας μηδαμῇ μηδαμῶς οἰκέταις.

CONCLUSION.

The use of the interjection increased steadily with each sphere of literature from Homer to Plato. With Plato it became almost universal.

In Homer the interjection was not used in prayers or in passages of dignity and elevation, but was freely used in the scenes at the hut of Eumaeus, and where Odysseus returned to his home in the guise of a beggar. In Lyric Poetry the interjection is most congenial to the drinking songs and the Carmina Popularia. In Aristophanes those plays which are least removed from the common people, as the Knights and the Peace, have the most vocatives with the interjection, and even in these plays the omissions are found in scenes of mock or actual elevation. The nearer literature drew to the language of the common people, the more the interjection was used. Evidently ὦ belonged to the sermo vulgaris and hence was too familiar to be used in lofty scenes by Homer or the Lyric Poets.

The interjection with the vocative was familiar, and was not freely used until the familiar language of comedy, dialectic, and

the law courts became the language of literature, when the vocative rarely appears without the interjection.¹

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY.

JOHN ADAMS SCOTT.

¹In the New Testament the interjection has practically vanished. In the four Gospels there are but three examples of *ὦ* with the vocative. *ὦ γενεὰ ἀπιστος*, Matth. XVII, 17; Mark IX, 19; Luke IX, 41. *ὦ ἀνόητοι καὶ βραδεῖς*, Luke XXIV, 25. and *ὦ γίναι* Matth. XV, 28. in each case the words of Jesus. Here the vocative has returned to the strictest Homeric use. No prayers have the interjection.